

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is being resubmitted in response to the second Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated May 26, 2006. The Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated May 19, 2005. Claims 1-38 are pending and claims 1, 8, 13, 20, 25-30, and 32-36 have been amended, and claims 7, 19, and 31 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-38 remain pending in the present application. An extension of time to extend the reply period for 3 months from August 19, 2005 to November 19, 2005 is requested herewith.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 7. Independent claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 19. And independent claim 25 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 31. Dependent claims 8, 20, 26-30, and 32-36 have been amended to correct claim dependencies. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered.

**Claims 37 and 38 are not anticipated under §102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 37 and 38 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent number 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. (Levergood). Anticipation requires a prior art reference to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. It is respectfully submitted that Levergood fails to teach every element of claims 37 and 38.

For example, Levergood may teach forwarding a service request (URL Get) from a client to a server and appending a session ID (SID) to the request that allows a user to access controlled files, but Levergood fails to teach or even suggest that his URL Get

appended with the SID is in “format in a form of scheme://servername/.../basedir;*parameters*/subdir/.../file.extension...wherein each parameter in the URL ticket includes a parameter name and a value: name1=value1;name2=value2; ...”

An example of the parameter name and a value pairs are given in the Specification, which provides an example of a URL ticket 25 as:

```
http://gfp/gforce/gfrepository/gf12345/678;start=1234567890;use-
by=1234568000;end=1234000000;clientid=192.168.1.14;
uid=mark;sessionid=abcdef...;
mac=hmac-md5,aBcD1234+-xYzWuV...zZ
/start.htm
```

In contrast, Levergood expressly describes his SID as a sixteen character ASCII string that encodes 96 bits of SID data, 6 bits per character. The SID contains a 32-bit digital signature, a 16-bit expiration date with a granularity of one hour, a 2-bit key identifier used for key management, an 8-bit domain comprising a set of information files to which the current SID authorizes access, and a 22-bit user identifier (col. 3, lines 54-60. As can be seen, Levergood’s SID fails to include any “parameter name and a value” pairs.

From the passage above, it is also apparent that Levergood fails to teach or suggest that his SID includes “a path parameter, a start parameter, a use-by parameter, an end parameter, a uid parameter, a clientid parameter, a sessionid parameter, a referrer parameter, and a message authentication code (MAC),” as required by claim 38. Accordingly, Levergood fails to anticipate claims 37 and 38.

### **Claims 1-36 are unobvious under §103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims number 1-36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood in view of the FileNet Enterprise Content Management Functionality sheet (FileNet). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

For the reasons above, Levergood fails to teach or suggest the limitation in independent claims 1, 13, and 25 that “the redirect URL ticket has the form: `scheme://servername/.../basedir;parameters/subdir/.../file.extension.`” As described in the specification, the “scheme” typically represents “http” or “https,” and the “server name” represents the DNS name of the replica server 26, and the portion of the URL prefix following the server name, up to and including the basedir value, indicates the portion of the content server’s or replica server’s content to which access is granted by the ticket. Each parameter in the URL ticket 25 includes a parameter name and a value: `name1=value1;name2=value2; ...` As specified in claims 7, 20, and 32, the parameters placed into the URL ticket 25 include a path parameter 150, a start parameter 152, a use-by parameter 154, an end parameter 156, a uid parameter 158, a clientid parameter 160, a sessionid parameter 162, a referrer parameter 164, and a message authentication code (MAC) parameter 166. The path parameter 150 identifies a top-level directory that contains the content. The start parameter 152, the use-by parameter 154, and the end parameter 156 indicate the lifetime of the URL ticket 25. The start parameter 152 is the time at which the URL becomes valid for use, preferably in seconds. The use-by parameter 154 is the time by which the URL must be used, or it will not be accepted as valid. And the end parameter 156 is the time at which the URL becomes invalid for use. As explained above, Levergood’s SID fails to include any “parameter name and a value” pairs; and the FileNet reference fails to cure this deficiency of Levergood.

In addition, according to the present invention, if the client IP address was known

for which the URL ticket 25 is valid, then only the start and end parameters 154 and 156 would be sufficient. However, the network topology and/or NAT may cause the client IP address to be different for the content server 22 and the replica server 26. Therefore, the present invention “binds” the combination of “basedir+path+sessionid” to an IP address at first use of the URL ticket 25. To avoid disclosure attacks where a valid user gets a URL ticket 25 but passes it on to a third party before using it, the time before first use is restricted to a smaller value than the URL validity range. It is believed Levergood fails to disclose the use of any “use-by parameter” and fails to disclose any functionality for operating with NAT. This functionality is provided by specifying the “parameter name and a value” pairs in the redirect URL, which is a limitation that a combination of Levergood and FileNet fail to teach or suggest.

The arguments above apply with full force and effect to the remaining dependent claims because they are based on allowable independent claims. Therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-38 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1-38 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

June 9, 2006

Date

/Stephen G. Sullivan/  
Stephen G. Sullivan  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 38,329  
(650) 969-7474